

Appl. No. 10/774,230

Amdt. Dated January 18, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office action mailed December 13, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 8, 13, and 19 being the independent claims. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention and claims 12 and 17 have been amended to correct minor editorial errors. The Applicants thank the Examiner for finding allowable subject matter in claims 2, 3, and 8-27. No new matter is believed to have been added.

I. Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for an informality on page 9, line 9, where the Examiner alleges that reference numeral "12" should read -19-. The Applicants have amended the specification to replace "12" with "19". Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action alleges that the limitation "said at least one modular effusion inner and outer panel" in line 9 of claim 1 lacks an antecedent basis.

Claim 1 has been amended to now recite, *inter alia*, replacing said at least one non-effusion inner and outer panel with at least one of a modular inner effusion panel subassembly and a modular outer effusion panel subassembly. Thus, the rejection is now moot, and the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent. No. 3,842,595 to Smith ("Smith") in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art

Appl. No. 10/774,230

Amdt. Dated January 18, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2005

("AAPA"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method of converting a non-effusion combustor liner to an effusion combustor liner and recites, *inter alia*, removing at least one of a non-effusion inner panel and a non-effusion outer panel from said non-effusion combustor liner, and replacing said at least one non-effusion inner and outer panel with at least one of a modular inner effusion panel subassembly and a modular outer effusion panel subassembly.

Smith teaches a modular gas turbine engine that includes a cold module, a combustion liner assembly, a nozzle diaphragm assembly, and a gas generator turbine module. See Abstract. However, nowhere does Smith remotely mention or even suggest that the combustion liner assembly is modular and that the assembly includes a modular inner effusion or non-effusion panel or a modular outer effusion or non-effusion panel. Rather, Smith teaches the removal of combustion liner assembly 30 as a whole, not removal of any of the panels.

Moreover, AAPA does not make up for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Smith. In particular, AAPA discloses an outer liner subassembly and an inner liner subassembly that are both integrated with the dome assembly, see para. [006], and are thus non-modular. Additionally, although AAPA discloses the desirability of including effusion holes, AAPA does not suggest replacing individual non-effusion panels with effusion panels. At best, AAPA suggests replacing the entire combustion liner assembly 30 of Smith with a new assembly that includes effusion cooling holes.

The Examiner is well aware that the three necessary criteria for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness include 1) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings, 2) a reasonable expectation of success, and 3) the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Accordingly, as the Examiner has not provided references that teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom (e.g. claims 4-7) is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

Appl. No. 10/774,230

Amdt. Dated January 18, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2005

IV. Conclusion

Based on the above, independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 19 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 1/18/06By: 

Cindy H. Kwacala

Reg. No. 47,867

(480) 385-5060